



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,328	03/24/2006	Shinji Mackawa	740756-2943	4975
22204	7590	12/03/2008		
NIXON PEABODY, LLP				
401 9TH STREET, NW				
SUITE 900				
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128				
EXAMINER				
HO, ANTHONY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2815				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/573,328

Applicant(s)

MAEKAWA, SHINJI

Examiner

ANTHONY HO

Art Unit

2815

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,6-9 and 12-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,6-9,15 and 17 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12,13,16 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/24/2006, 9/19/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group II (claims 2-3 and 6-10) in the reply filed on September 19, 2008 is acknowledged.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on March 24, 2006 was filed after the mailing date of the instant application on March 24, 2006. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on September 19, 2008 was filed after the mailing date of the instant application on March 24, 2006. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12, 13, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Masatoshi et al (JP 2000-066233).

In re claims 12, 16 and 18, Masatoshi et al discloses forming a gate electrode (2) over a substrate (1) having an insulating surface; forming a first insulating film (3) over the gate electrode; forming source and drain electrodes (4, 5) over the first insulating film; forming a semiconductor film (6) containing an organic material over the source and drain electrodes; and forming a mask over the semiconductor film (i.e. paragraph 0030); etching the semiconductor film using a mask to form a semiconductor layer (paragraph 0030); and forming a second insulating film (11) over the mask (Drawing 3; Drawing 6 and corresponding paragraphs).

In re claim 13, Masatoshi et al discloses the mask is formed by a droplet discharge method (paragraph 0032).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12, 13, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuya et al (JP 07-221367) in view of Masatoshi et al (JP 2000-066233).

In re claims 12 and 18, Katsuya et al discloses a method for manufacturing a semiconductor device comprising the steps of: forming a first insulating film (22) over a substrate (21); forming source and drain electrodes (24) over the first insulating film; forming a semiconductor film (25) containing an organic material over the source and drain electrodes; and forming a mask (27) over the semiconductor film (Drawing 3 and corresponding paragraphs).

Masatoshi et al discloses forming a gate electrode (2) over a substrate (1) having an insulating surface; etching the semiconductor film using a mask to form a semiconductor layer (paragraph 0030); and forming a second insulating film (11) over the mask (Drawing 3; Drawing 6 and corresponding paragraphs).

The advantage is to obtain a semiconductor device having good threshold characteristics (Abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified the method of manufacturing a semiconductor device as taught by Katsuya et al with forming a gate electrode over a substrate having an insulating surface; etching the semiconductor film using the mask to form a semiconductor layer; and forming a second insulating film over the mask as taught by Masatoshi et al in order to obtain a semiconductor device having good threshold characteristics.

In re claim 13, Masatoshi et al discloses the mask is formed by a droplet discharge method (paragraph 0032).

The advantage is to obtain a semiconductor device having good threshold characteristics (Abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified the method of manufacturing a semiconductor device as taught by Katsuya et al with the mask is formed by a droplet discharge method as taught by Masatoshi et al in order to obtain a semiconductor device having good threshold characteristics.

In re claim 16, Masatoshi et al discloses the mask is formed by an organic material (entire document).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-3, 6-9, 15 and 17 are allowed.

Claim 14 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY HO whose telephone number is (571)270-1432. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 10:30AM-9:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Parker can be reached on 571-272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 2815

/Jerome Jackson Jr./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2815